UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,170	01/10/2007	Bruno Bozionek	2003P13552WOUS	4107
22116 SIEMENS COR	7590 06/22/201 RPORATION	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			MAI, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/574,170	BOZIONEK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KEVIN S. MAI	2456		

	REVIN S. WAI	2430	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	**	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a convergence NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alleged non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>24-29,31-34,44-52 and 54</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Rupal D. Dharia/	/K. S. M./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2400	Examiner, Art Unit 2456		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Albuquerque does not disclose bandwidth testing. Applicant has argued that continuous monitoring is not testing. However examiner disagrees, regardless of the monitoring going on continuously it is nonetheless being tested. Then as to what is done to cause the reporting of the link speed, paragraph [0066] explains that the BM evaluates the flows on the link to verify that the flows are still able to be transmitted in the available time of the frame. It is noted that while applicant implies that the claim contains a limitation discussing a cause, it is actually only contained in the preamble, and the method simply claims triggering a bandwidth test.

Applicant argues that Albuquerque does not disclose bandwidth requests sent to terminals. Examiner disagrees. Paragraph [0032] discloses the AC system determines link speed, and it's reasonable to say such a determination would occur via a request. Thus it is seen there is support and it would not go against the principle operation.

Applicant further argues the art does not disclose registering bandwidth of each connection after each hop. Examiner disagrees. Paragraph [0032] discloses the AC system determines link speed and this is seen to be done for the network and accordingly since all connections are determined then all connections after hops are registered.

Applicant further argues that the art does not disclose assembly of data. Examiner disagrees. The AC system provides for communication control over the links as well as determining link speed, accordingly it is seen that the network as a whole is considered and as such the data was assembled.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 48 are the same as those used previously and have been addressed in the previous office action dated 4/20/10

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 54 are the same as those used previously and have been addressed in the previous office action dated 4/20/10. It is noted that applicant states that paragraph [0044] does not support examiners assertions. Examiner disagrees. The cited portion continues to say "or to transmit on a best-effort mode obtaining bandwidth when available.